NOTES ON SOME NEOTROPICAL BIRDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL MUSEUM.

BY HANS VON BERLEPSCH.

The authorities of the United States National Museum having, with their usual kindness, sent me for examination, at my request, several obscure specimens belonging to that establishment which I was anxious to see, I have studied them carefully, and now wish to offer some notes thereon. To the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and the Director of the National Museum my best thanks are due for thus facilitating my work.

I begin by offering some notes on the Humming-birds which are ineluded in the lot.

 Phaëthornis superciliosus (LINN.) ex Bahia = Ph. pretrei (LESS. & DEL.). No. 44976. Bahia ex Lawrence.

This specimen is by no means = Ph. superciliosus (L.) apud ELLIOT, but proves to be a Bahia skin of Ph. pretrei (LESS. & DEL.) in much faded plumage. Ph. pretrei of Lesson and Delattre was once believed by Messrs. Cabanis and Heine to be true superciliosus LIN. (ex BRIS-SON), and Mr. J. Gould, when writing his monograph, unfortunately accepted this identification. More recently Messrs. Salvin and Elliot have shown that true superciliosus of Linnæus is the same as Ph. fraterculus GOULD and Ph. consobrinus "BOURC." REICHB. or Ph. moorei LAWR. While I agree perfectly with the last-named authors in placing these names among the synonyms of Ph. superciliosus, I nevertheless regard the Ph. malaris NORDM. to be quite a distinct species, occurring in Cayenne along with Ph. supereiliosus, from which it is distinguishable by its much superior size and other points of difference. I believe Ph. malaris to be restricted to Cayenne. The types, belonging to the Berlin Museum, which I have examined, are said to be from Brazil (through Gello and Olfers), but this statement is probably erroneous.*

2. Phaëthornis longirostris (LESS.) ex Pebas = Ph. superciliosus (L.). No. 55374, male Pebas, Peru (ex Williams College).

In his catalogue of Trochilidæ in the collection of the U. S. National Museum (Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1880, p. 309, note,) Mr. Ridgway says

^{*} In the Museum Heineanum, at Halberstadt, there are likewise three specimens of Ph. malaris, believed to be from Brazil, but no authority stating the correctness of this habitat is to be found on the labels. As far as I can make out from the mode of preparation in these stuffed specimens, they appear to have been once genuine Cayenne skins, showing their tails dried in the form of a fan, which I have observed in all the skins of Humming-birds which are sent from that country. I possess three undoubted Cayenne skins of Ph. malaris in my collection. It is the "Brin-blane" of Andebert and Vieillot, etc. (H. v. B.)

that this specimen "is not distinguishable from northern specimens o *Ph. longirostris.*" I, however, find that the skin in question belongs to true *Ph. superciliosus* (L.) *apud* ELLIOT, agreeing perfectly with other specimens from Upper Amazonia and British Guiana. Mr. Ridgway may have compared it with his *Ph. superciliosus* from Bahia, which is = *pretrei*. I may remark that *Ph. superciliosus* is easily distinguish able from *Ph. longirostris* in having the upper tail-coverts green, tipped with pale fulvous, while in *longirostris* they are deep fulvous, barreck with 2 to 3 dark (greenish) bands.

3. Phaëthornis longirostris (Less.) ex Turbo; name correct

No. 17918, male, Turbo (coll. Schott), type of Ph. cassini LAWR.

This is evidently a young bird presenting many signs of immaturity. Unfortunately it is a bad and imperfect skin, and in consequence of this it is difficult to make a close comparison with specimens of *Phi longirostris* from Central America. I may, however, note that in the Turbo bird the upper tail-coverts are of a deeper tint, being more brownish fulvous. The back is dark brown, with slight bronze reflections, instead of being green. The stripe in the middle of upper throat and the mystacal stripe are of a deeper fulvous. The under parts are generally darker and more mixed with grayish brown.

 Phaëthornis squalidus (TEM.) ex Rio Negro; name correct, locality incorrect. No. 24534, Rio Negro (ex Dr. HEERMANN).

The skin of this bird is of the peculiar make by which all skins of trade coming from Southern Brazil are recognizable *primovisu*. If Rio Negro means the northern confluent of the Amazon the locality is evidently erroneous, but there is a river "Rio Negro" on the northern frontier of Sta. Catarina where the skin may have really come from.

 Phaëthornis adolphi GOULD *ex* Turbo = *Ph. striigularis* GLD. No. 17915, female, Turbo (coll. Michler).

This is by no means *Ph. adolphi*, but *Ph. striigularis* GLD., agreeing with specimens of that species from Bogota and Porto Cabello.

6. Campylopterus lazulus (VIEILL.) *ex* Peru; name correct, locality erroneous. No. 11744, male, Peru (C. Raymoud).

This species has not yet been stated to occur in Peru, and the locality attributed to the specimen is most probably erroneous. The skin looks like a Bogota skin, and agrees with others from that locality.

 Lafresnaya flavicaudata (FRAS.) cr Popayan; name correct, locality erroncous. No. 24565, male, Popayan (Dr. Heermann).

This species has not yet been mentioned from Popayan, where, however, *L. sanla* (BOURC. & DEL.) has been stated to occur. I believe the specimen in question to be simply a so-called Bogota skin. It does not differ from specimens sent from that region. The species ought to be called *L. lafresnayei* (BOISS.), or, as I prefer, *Entima lafresnayei* (BOISS.).

560

 Florisnga mellivora (L.) ex Tres Marias; name correct, locality erroneous. No. 25851, male, Tres Marias Islands, July, 1861 (John Xantus).

As in the case of other specimens of Humming-birds forwarded by J. Xantus and labeled as having been collected in the Tres Marias Islands, I believe this locality to be clearly erroneous. The specimen of *F. mellivora* in question is apparently of the same make as the skin of Uranomitra guatemalensis, also said to be from Tres Marias. Both skins may have really come from Guatemala. The *Florisuga* specimen is a young male in imperfect plumage.

9. Helianthea lutetiæ (DEL. & BOURC.) er Popayan; correct.

No. 29277, male, Popayan (D. G. Elliot).

This bird agrees with specimens from Quito in Museum. H.v. B.

10. Thalurania glaucopis (GML.) ex Tres Marias; name correct, locality erroneous. No. 25851, female, Tres Marias Islands, July, 1861 (John Xantus). Type of Th. Incic. LAWR.

I quite agree with the opinion expressed by Messrs. Elliot and Ridgway, viz, that the bird in question belongs to *Th. glaucopis* (GML.), male juvenile, the locality, Tres Marias, being no doubt erroneous. The skin is of the unmistakable make of all Rio skins, which are sent in large numbers annually to the great markets of Europe. The yellow spot on the under mandible, mentioned by Mr. Lawrence as the chief distinguishing character of his *Th. luciw*, only presents itself on one side of the under mandible and is simply the result of an injury, the rhamphotheca on that part having been rubbed away.

11. Thalurania eriphile (LESS.) ex Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality probably erroneous.

No. 68314, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

Agrees with a specinien from Bahia in Museum H. v. B. I much doubt the correctness of the habitat Rio Grande do Sul, this species not having been stated to occur so far south.

12. Cephalolepis delalandi (VIEILL.) ex Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality probably erroneous.

No. 68313, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

This is true *C. delalandi*, agreeing with specimens from Rio de Janeiro. The locality, Rio Grande do Sul, has not yet been mentioned for this species, and I do not believe it occurs there, as that province is the home of *C. loddigesi*.

13. Aglæactis caumatonota (GOULD) ex Peru; correct.

No. 39931, Matara Ayacucho, October 22, 1864 (Walter S. Church). Type of A. olivaceocauda LAWR.

This specimen appears not to be different from true A. caumatonota GLD., the type of which came likewise from Peru.

14. Uranomitra quadricolor (VIEILL.) ex Mazatlan—not of Vieillot=U. ellioti BERL. No. 115285. Mazatlan in summer.

This is evidently the species named U. quadricolor by Mr. D. G. Elliot, but it is not the quadricolor of Vieillot, which I believe to be the

Proc. N. M. 88-36

Sept. 25, 1889.

same as the bird which we used to call U. cyanocephala. In his description of Trochilus quadricolor, Vicillot says. "un beau vert brille sur les flancs," which is by no means the case in U. quadricolor of Elliot, but applies well to U. cyanocephala anet. Therefore it becomes necessary to bestow a new name upon the species named U. quadricolor by Mr. Elliot, and I propose to call it in future U. ellioti BERL. I believe the locality, Mazatlan, has not been mentioned elsewhere for this species.

15. Uranomitra quadricolor (VIEILL.) juv. fere pull. *ex* Orizaba=Sphenoproctus *curvipennis* (LICHT.)

No. 38224 (jnv. fere pull.) Orizaba (Botteri).

This is by no means an *Uranomitra*, but a very young bird of *Sphenoproctus curvipenuis*, which is evident from the long yellowish legs and claws, as well as from the structure of the wings and the blackish tailfeathers, also the grass green color of the back, etc.

-- 16. Uranomitra viridifrons Elliot; correct.

No. 57774, male, Tehnantepee, Sta. Efigenia, 22d, December, 1868 (Prof. F. Sumichrast).

This species, which agrees with U. *violiceps* in the coppery hue on the tail-feathers, I had never seen before. The locality, Tehuantepee, is interesting as showing that U. *viridifrons* occurs in a locality where U. *violiceps* is also found. I confess I am not quite convinced that these forms are really distinct specifically.

17. Uranomitra guatemalensis Gould *ex* Tres Marias; name correct, locality erroneous.

No. 25855, female, Tres Marias, July. 1861 (Xantus).

Agrees with specimens from Guatemala. The locality, Tres Marias, is doubtless erroneous. See remarks under the head of *Florisuga mellivora*, etc.

18. Agyrtria tephrocephala (VIEILL.) ex Surinam = A. rividissima (LESS.).

No. 70577, Surinam (C. F. Hering).

This is by no means = A. tephrocephala (VIEILL.), which is a much larger bird with uniform pure white under tail coverts, and is exclusively found in Southern Brazil. The Surinam bird belongs to the species sometimes called A. linnwi, or more recently by Mr. D. G. Elliott A. tolaci (GML.). I, however, believe it entitled to the name of A. viridissima (LESS.), the Trochilus tobaci of Gmelin being most probably the same as Pyrrhophwna crythronota.

19. Amazilia cyanura GOULD er Retaleulen, Guatemala; correct.

No. 33654, Guatemala, Retaleuleu, Pacific coast, September, 1862 (O. Salvin).

This is an excellent species which I had not seen before, it being somewhat rare in collections. It comes nearest to *A. devillei sive marice* (BOURC.), but is easily distinguishable by its steel-blue tail, bluish instead of rufous under tail coverts, and the greater restriction of the cinnamon color on the base of the secondaries. The green of the body above and

562

beneath is of a darker hue and of a more bluish cast, and this color extends over the middle of the back, which in A. devillei is of the same coppery bronze as the lower back.

20. Juliamyia typica BP. ex Turbo = Damophila juliæ (BOURC.). No. 17902, male, Turbo (Schott).

The Turbo bird belongs to the race with a glittering brilliant crown, viz, true D. julia (BOURC.), of which J. typica BP. and J. feliciana LESS. are synonyms, and not to the form with a dull colored crown inhabiting Panama, which I have named D. panamensis (cf. Journ. für Orn., 1884, p. 312).

21. Hylocharis sapphirina (Gml.) ex Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality probably incorrect.

No. 68312, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

Agrees with specimens from Rio de Janeiro and Bahia. I much doubt the correctness of the habitat Rio Grande do Sul, the species not having been mentioned from there elsewhere.

22. Hylocharis cyanea (VIEILL.) ex Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality probably erroneous.

No. 63315, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

As in the case of H. sapphirina, I doubt the correctness of the habitat. The specimen agrees with others from Rio de Janeiro and Bahia.

23. Cyanophaia cœruleigularis (GOULD) ex Cartagena = C. luminosa (LAWR.) ad. No. 17912, Cartagena (A. Schott).

This is by no means C. cæruleigularis (GLD.), but belongs to C. luminosa, agreeing perfectly with specimen No. 17911 (named luminosa) in size and general coloration. The blue on the throat appearing here and there I regard to be simply the result of an abrasion of the feathers. In fact the bird is in much worn plumage.

24. Cyanophaia luminosa (LAWR.) er Cartagena-correct.

No. 17911, Cartagena (A. Schott). Beyond the differences stated by Mr. George N. Lawrence to exist between this species and S. goudoti I may note that in C. luminosa the

upper part of the head is of a much darker and a quite dull green of a bluish cast (being somewhat luminous green in C. goudoti), and that it has a much shorter bill.

25. Chlorostilbon pucherani (BOURC. & MULS.) er Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality erroneous.

No. 68310, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

This is true Chl. pucherani, agreeing with specimens from Rio de Janeiro in my collection. In Rio Grande do Sul Chl. pucherani is replaced by Chl. splendidus egregius HEINE, which has a much longer bill. It follows that the locality given by Albuquerque must be erroneous, and in fact his specimen is of the unmistakable make of all the skins imported from Rio de Janeiro.

- + 26. Chlorostilbon pucherani (BOURC. & MULS.) ex Tres Marias; name correct, locality erroneous.
 - No. 25856, Tres Marias Islands, July, 1861 (John Xantus). Type of Ch. insularis LAWR.

This specimen is certainly referable to *Chl. pucherani*, as already pointed out by Messrs. Elliot and Ridgway. It is a young male in not quite mature plumage. The make up of the skin is that of all the skins received from Rio de Janeiro, and the habitat, Tres Marias Islands, is no doubt erroneous.

27. Chlorostilbon angustipennis (FRAS.) female, ex Cartago=Chl. salvini (CAB. & HEINE).?

No. 42986, temale, Cartago, January, 1866 (J. Cooper).

I am not quite sure if this is really a female of *Chl. assimilis* LAWR., united by Mr. Elliot (incorrectly as I believe) with his "*angustipennis*" (not of Fraser). Before having seen an adult male of *Chl. assimilis* from Costa Rica I am rather inclined to believe the female from Cartago to be referable to *Chl. salvini* (CAB. & HEINE). It has a uniformly black upper mandible, but the basal half of the under mandible is flesh-colored, while it is uniformly black in the male of *Chl. assimilis*.

28. Chlorostilbon angustipennis (FRAS.) male, juvenile, ex Pebas = Chl. daphn "Bourc." Gould.

No. 55382, male, Pebas, Pern (Orton).

This is not angustipennis of Elliot, nor of Fraser, but belongs to the section of *Chlorostilbon* with a square tail, of which *Chl. prasinus* is the type. I believe the young male from Pebas entitled to the name of *Chl. daphne* "BOURC." GOULD, of which *Chl. peruanus* GOULD is probably a synonym.

The following notes relate to some other types of birds of different families belonging to the U. S. National Museum, which were kindly sent to me for examination in 1886:

1. Campylorhynchus brevipennis LAWR. = C, nuchalis CAB, juvenile.!

No. 109509, Veneznela, Krider; type of C. brevipendis LAWR., Ann. Lyc. N. H., New York, VIII (1866), page 344.

This is certainly a very young bird of *C. nuchalis* CAB. I got a similar specimen from Puerto Cabello, which is in more advanced plumage, but presents still all the peculiarities of coloration which induced Mr. Lawrence to institute a new species. I possess also young birds of *C. pardus* BP. from Baranquilla, and of *C. brevirostris* LAFR. from Bogota, which are in a similar stage of plumage.

2. Saltator fulviventris LAWR.=S. carulescens VIEILL., juvenile.

No. 54261, Paraguay, 3-49. No. 3. Eyes dark; legs dark. U. S. steamer Water Witch, Capt. T. J. Page, U. S. Navy. Type of S. fulviventris LAWR., Ann. Lyc. N. H., New York, VIII (1864), p. 41.

This is evidently an immature bird in transition plumage, and I have not the slightest doubt that it is the young of *S. carulescens* VIEILL.

564

S. fulviventris LAWR. has not been mentioned in Mr. Selater's Catalogue of the Tanagridæ (Vol. xt of Catalogue British Museum).

3. Philydor rufobrunneus LAWR.=bona species, potius Automolus.!

No. 34770, male, Barranca, Costa Rica, 18th April, 1864, J. Carmiol; type of Ph. refobrunneus LAWR Ann. Lyc. N. H., New York, VIII (1865), p. 127.

Apparently an excellent species which seems to have its nearest ally in *Automolus rubiginosus* SCL. It is certainly not a *Philydor*. The type, as far as I know, remains still unique. From *A. rubiginosus* it may be distinguished by the following diagnosis:

Ph. rubiginoso affinis, sed coloribus multo dilutioribus, capite supra obscure olivaceo-brunneo (nec rufobrunneo), capitis lateribus ochraceo variegatis. Gala dilutiore ochraceo plumis gulæ inferioris lateraliter fusco marginatis, pectore olivaceo tineto pallide ochraceo striato. Abdomine brunnescentiore. Dorso uropygio, alis candaque necnon tectricibus subcandalibus pallidioribus. Alis candaque longioribus, rostro vero multo breviore, mandibula fere omnino fusca distinguendus. Al. 94, cand. 92, mandibula 13², tars. 26⁴ mm.

4. Philydor virgatus LAWR.=bona species, potius Automolus.

No. 42959, Angostura, Costa Rica, Oct. 7, 18, 66, length, 74; extent, 9. Iris brown. J. Carmiol; type of *Philydor virgatus* LAWR., Ann. Lyc. N. H., New York, VIII (1867), p. 468.

This may be a valid species but not of the genus *Philydor*, as I think. In fact, it seems to be a close ally of *Automolus subulatus* (SPIX) *ex* Amazonia, from which it may be distinguished by the following points of difference: Bill longer and somewhat stronger, the upper mandible darker in color. The ground color of the top of the head more blackish. The ochraceous stripes there and still more on the hind neck on the upper back are much more pronounced. The ground color everywhere on the upper parts darker or more blackish. The under parts of the body are rather lighter in color. Throat and breast of a clearer ochraceous. Wings and tail somewhat longer. (Al. $84\frac{1}{2}$, caud. 72, eulm. $23\frac{3}{4}$, tars. $20\frac{1}{2}$ ^{mm}.)

5. Automolus rufescens LAWR.=Philydor panerythrus SCL.

No. 39065, Costa Rica (Birris), female, 194, May 15, 1865; iris black; length 74; José C. Zeledon; type of A. rufescens LAWR. Ann. Lyc. N. H., New York, VIII (1866), p. 345.

I have had no typical specimens of *Ph. panerythrus* ScL. from Colombia for comparison, but a specimen from Veragua in my collection agrees very well with the type of *A. rufescens* LAWR. The latter is but a little paler and has somewhat shorter wings; al. $95\frac{1}{2}$, caud. 86, culm. $19\frac{1}{4}$, tars. $22\frac{3}{4}$ mm. Mr. O. Salvin, in Ibis, 1870, p. 110, has already stated the absolute identity of Lawrence's type with Sclate's type of *Ph. panerythrus*.

6. Anabazenops lineatus LAWR. should stand as A. subalaris lineatus (LAWR.).

No. 34766, Augostura, Costa Rica, female, 21, April, 1864 ; J. Carmiol. Type of A. lineatus LAWR. Ann. Lyc. N. H., New York, VIII (1865), p. 127.

In the Ibis, 1870, p. 110, Mr. O. Salvin declared that the type of A. lineatus LAWR. differed in no way from the types of A. subalaris SCL. from Echador. Having compared the above type with another skin from Costa Rica in my collection and specimens from Western Ecuador (true *subalaris*), I have found several slight though apparently constant points of difference which induce me to regard *A. lineatus* as a northern form or subspecies of *A. subalaris*, from which it may be distinguished by the following diagnosis:

+A. subalaris lineatus (LAWR.).

A. subalari simillimus, sed major, rostro imprimis longiore, differt etiam corpore supra saturatius rufo-bruuneo (in subalari magis olivaceo-brunneo), dorso obsoletius striato, striis in dorso medio evanescentibus. Corpore subtus paulo rufescentiore, gula purius stramineo (in subalari magis ochraceo) flava. Subalaribus intensius rufo cinnamomeis.

Specimens.	Al.	Caud.	Culm.	Tars.
 A. subalaris SCL.: Male, Cayandeled, Western Ecuador, March 16, 1883 Male, Cayandeled, Western Ecuador, February 13, 1883 Male, Cayandeled, Western Ecuador, February 1, 1883 Male, Pedregal (2,800), Western Ecuador, February 14, 1883 Female, Chaquarpata (5,700') Western Ecuador, March 5, 1883 Female, Angostura, Costa Rica, April 21, 1864 (type) Adult, Costa Rica, Mus. H. v. B	86 <u>1</u> 89 82 85 85 <u>1</u> 87 96	75 72 72 74 72 74 72 79 87	$ \begin{array}{r} 19\frac{1}{2} \\ 19\frac{1}{4} \\ 19\frac{1}{4} \\ 18 \\ 19\frac{1}{4} \\ 20\frac{3}{4} \\ 21\frac{1}{5} \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} Mm. \\ 22\frac{1}{2} \\ 23\frac{1}{2} \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 21\frac{1}{2} \\ 22\frac{1}{2} \\ 21\frac{1}{2} \\ 23\frac{1}{2} \\ 23\frac{1}{2} \end{array}$

MUENDEN, May, 1889.